United Nations E/2006/SR.46

Economic and Social Council

Provisional

16 January 2007

Original: English

Resumed substantive session of 2006

Provisional summary record of the 46th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 11 December 2006, at 11.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Hachani ..... (Tunisia)

Contents

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(g) Human rights (*continued*)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

06-65102 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11.40 a.m.

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)
(E/2006/32 (Parts I and II); E/2006/L.24, L.25 and L.26)

1. **The President** recalled that, at the Council's substantive session of 2006, a number of draft proposals had been deferred to the resumed session so as to give delegations the opportunity to consider additional information on the applications for consultative status submitted by three organizations: the Danish National Association for Gays and Lesbians, the Lesbian and Gay Federation in Germany, and the International Lesbian and Gay Association-Europe. The Secretariat had provided Council members with full information regarding those applications and their consideration by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, including the full transcripts of the latter's discussions on them.

2. Also pending were two draft decisions to take note of, respectively, the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2006 regular session (E/2006/32 (Part I)) and the Committee's report on its resumed 2006 session (E/2006/32 (Part II)).

3. **Mr. Jokinen** (Observer for Finland), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union strongly believed that every NGO, regardless of its nature, was entitled to treatment which was in accordance with Council resolution 1996/31 on the consultative relationship between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations and which followed the standard practice of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. The principles of non-discrimination and diversity were very dear to the European Union.

4. Resolution 1996/31 explicitly confirmed the need to take into account the full diversity of NGOs and specified that such organizations would be granted consultative status if they were concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Council and its subsidiary bodies; had aims and purposes that were in conformity with the spirit, purposes and principles of the Charter; and undertook to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities.

5. The three organizations under consideration met those criteria. Much of their work was in support of United Nations activities. A number of similar organizations had been accredited for participation in the recent High-level Meeting on HIV/AIDS, without complaint from other participants, in recognition of the contribution that they could make to those discussions. The three organizations in question were also keen to use accreditation to promote the work of the United Nations.

6. To date, over 2,800 NGOs had been granted consultative status based on the principles contained in resolution 1996/31. Many of them undoubtedly espoused views or policies that were not necessarily shared by States members of the European Union. However, the European Union still believed that they had a right to make their views known at the United Nations.

7. In recent years, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had rejected applications for consultative status or withdrawn that status only in cases where the organization concerned had carried out activities against a Member State or had been involved in or connected to terrorist activities. The organizations under consideration obviously did not fall into that category.

8. Furthermore, the representatives of the organizations in question had provided fully satisfactory answers to all the questions asked by members of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations when their applications had been considered by that body. No credible reasons had been given for refusing them consultative status.

9. The Economic and Social Council was the parent body of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. According to paragraph 15 of resolution 1996/31, the granting, suspension and withdrawal of consultative status, as well as the interpretation of norms and decisions relating to that matter, were the prerogative of Member States exercised through the Economic and Social Council and its Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations.

10. At its substantive session in July, the Council had duly rejected the draft decisions recommended by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations regarding the applications of the three organizations in question, and had adopted a decision not to send the application of the Danish National Association for Gays and Lesbians back to the Committee. The Council's will had already been clearly expressed: the organizations in question were entitled to consultative status.

11. The European Union would have preferred to conclude the Council's consideration of the item in July. However, after listening to the views of delegations during those proceedings, including requests for further information, it had agreed to defer the Council's decision to the resumed session. Now that that information had been provided, he trusted that all delegations were ready to complete the work started at the substantive session.

12. **Ms. Stewart** (Canada) conveyed her delegation's support for the three draft decisions sponsored by Finland on behalf of the European Union (E/2006/L.24, L.25 and L.26), whereby the Council would grant consultative status to the three organizations in question. Canada strongly supported an inclusive United Nations that allowed room for diverse voices to be heard. Resolution 1996/31 clearly stated the need to take account of the full diversity of NGOs. Her delegation expected the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations to ensure fair consideration of all applications from NGOs, including by following its established practice of engaging in dialogue. Unfortunately, the Committee had failed to do that. She called on the Council to avoid repeating what appeared to be a pattern of discrimination by the Committee. It was crucial for NGOs representing diverse constituencies within civil society to have an equal opportunity to express their views in United Nations forums.

13. **Mr. Jolle** (Observer for Norway), speaking also on behalf of New Zealand, said that the United Nations was, and should remain, an intergovernmental organization where decisions were taken by its Member States. At the same time, the relationship between the United Nations and NGOs was as old as the Charter itself and critical to the work of the United Nations.

14. Contemporary issues were very different from those that had faced the world when the United Nations had been created and could not be resolved by Governments alone. New Zealand and Norway strongly concurred with the finding of the report of the Panel of Eminent Persons on United Nations-Civil Society Relations (A/58/817) that global threats such as terrorism, climate change and AIDS required global solutions involving all stakeholders. Meeting future challenges called for real partnerships between Governments and the NGO community. To expand and deepen relationships with NGOs was to strengthen the intergovernmental debate.

15. In addressing difficult issues, decision-makers must work hand in hand with decision-shapers. Member States needed strong advocates for otherwise easily forgotten causes and the expertise and perspective that decision-shapers could provide. The exemplary partnership between NGOs and Member States in drafting a convention on the rights of persons with disabilities was a case in point.

16. All applications for consultative status should be considered objectively on the basis of the criteria set out in resolution 1996/31. The organizations in question should be given a fair hearing and judged on their merits. It was a matter of serious concern that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had not engaged in a substantive discussion on the applications of the organizations in question or given a reason for refusing them consultative status, particularly since many such organizations had played a major role in the international debate on HIV/AIDS. The applications of numerous NGOs dealing with non-discrimination clearly indicated the need for civil society representation at the United Nations. There was extensive evidence of violations, based on sexual orientation and gender identity, of the right to life and to freedom from violence and torture. While the United Nations maintained the responsibility for monitoring compliance with human rights obligations, it needed to engage with civil society in its efforts to uphold the core principle of non-discrimination. He called on Council members to ensure that the three applications in question were considered on their merits.

17. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the three applications in question.

18. **Ms. Ayesha** (Pakistan), supported by the representatives of Guinea-Bissau, the Russian Federation, Colombia, Mauritania and Saudi Arabia, said that she had understood the meeting announcement in the *Journal* to mean that the Council would take action on the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations at the afternoon meeting. She therefore requested that the issue should be deferred until the afternoon.

19. **Ms. Pliner** (Secretary of the Council) said that the *Journal* announcement was written in the usual way. It should be understood to mean that the two

items listed would be discussed at the morning meeting and, if necessary, at an afternoon meeting.

20. **Mr. Frick** (Germany) said that the *Journal* announcement was very clear. He appealed to the Council to take action immediately.

21. **The President** suggested, in light of the views expressed, that consideration of the item should be postponed until the afternoon meeting.

22. *It was so decided.*

23. **Mr. Ballestero** (Costa Rica) said that his delegation did not object to the decision to postpone consideration of the item until the afternoon. However, there had been confusion over *Journal* announcements for many years and the format used — which was the same for all bodies — had never been changed. Either the format should be corrected or it should be made clear that the current format was the norm and could not be cited as a reason to defer consideration of a given item. The decision just taken by the Council should not become a precedent.

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(g) Human rights (*continued*) (A/61/41)

24. **The President** drew attention to the report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (A/61/41). The Council had been unable to take note of the report at its substantive session in July because the report's issuance had been delayed. In the absence of any comments, he took it that the Council wished to take note of the report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (A/61/41).

25. *It was so decided.*

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.

United Nations E/2006/SR.47

Economic and Social Council

Provisional

12 January 2007

Original: English

Resumed substantive session for 2006

Provisional summary record of the 47th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 11 December 2006, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. Hachani ..... (Tunisia)

Contents

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

06-65105 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

Non-governmental organizations (*continued*)
(E/2006/32, Parts I and II, E/2006/L.24, E/2006/L.25 and E/2006/L.26)

Draft decision: Application for consultative status of the Danish National Association of Gays and Lesbians (E/2006/L.24)

1. After a procedural discussion in which **Mr. Frick** (Germany), **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau) and **Ms. Houngbedji** (Benin) took part and representatives of the Secretariat provided clarifications, **the President** invited the Council to take action on the draft decision in document E/2006/L.24.

2. **Mr. Frick** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Danish National Association of Gays and Lesbians fully met the criteria established by the Council in resolution 1996/31 for the granting of consultative status. During the consideration of the application by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the Association had provided satisfactory responses to questions and had been prepared to provide further information. No valid reasons had been advanced for rejecting the application. At its substantive session in July, the Council had rejected the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations not to grant consultative status to the Association and had decided not to refer the application back to that Committee. However, since some delegations had wanted to obtain more information on the application, the Council had deferred the issue to the current resumed session. The European Union believed that the Association deserved to be granted special consultative status by the Council and invited all delegations to support draft decision E/2006/L.24.

3. **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation was opposed to all forms of discrimination. As a matter of procedure, however, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should be given the opportunity to fully consider all requests put before it. The requests of a number of delegations in respect of the draft decisions under consideration had not been considered with due diligence or with the necessary impartiality. It was the position of his delegation that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should have an opportunity to reconsider its decision, in order to achieve a judgment based on the criteria embodied in the Charter of the United Nations. In order not to further undermine the credibility of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations his delegation would not participate in any votes held under the item.

4. *The vote was taken by roll-call.*

5. *Tunisia, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour:

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Panama, Poland, Republic of Korea, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Bangladesh, Benin, Chad, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Costa Rica, Guyana, Haiti, India, Paraguay, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey.

6. *Draft decision E/2004/L.24 was adopted by 23 votes to 16, with 11 abstentions.*

Draft decision: Application for consultative status of the International Lesbian and Gay Association-Europe (E/2006/L.25)

7. **The President** informed the Council that the Russian Federation would not renew its request for the application to be referred back to the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. He invited the Council to take action on the draft decision in document E/2006/L.25.

8. **Mr. Frick** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the International Lesbian and Gay Association-Europe met the criteria established by the Council in its resolution 1996/31 for the granting of consultative status. During the consideration of the application by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the Association had provided satisfactory responses to questions and had

been prepared to provide further information. No valid reasons had been advanced for rejecting the application. At its substantive session in July, the Council had rejected the recommendation of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations not to grant consultative status to the Association and had decided not to refer the application back to that Committee. However, since some delegations had wanted to obtain more information on the application, the Council had deferred the issue to the current resumed session.

9. The Association fought for human rights and against discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation, gender expression and gender identity at the European level. While it worked to promote universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, people in Europe and elsewhere still faced discrimination and prejudice, including in education, employment and health, on grounds of sexual orientation. The European Union firmly believed that the Association deserved to be granted special consultative status by the Council and invited all delegations to support draft decision E/2006/L.25.

10. *The vote was taken by roll-call.*

11. *The Czech Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour:

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Panama, Poland, Republic of Korea, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Bangladesh, Benin, Chad, China, Costa Rica, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Guyana, Haiti, India, Paraguay, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey.

12. *Draft decision E/2004/L.25 was adopted by 23 votes to 17, with 10 abstentions.*

Draft decision: Application of the Lesbian and Gay Federation of Germany for consultative status (E/2006/L.26)

13. **The President** invited the Council to take action on the draft decision in document E/2006/L.26.

14. **Mr. Frick** (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the Lesbian and Gay Federation of Germany was a member of the German Human Rights Forum, the umbrella organization of the leading 45 human rights non-governmental organizations in Germany. It had engaged in extensive dialogue with the Government and had been a valuable partner for programmes run by the Federal Ministry of Justice and the Federal Ministry for Social Affairs. It was actively working for non-discrimination at the international level. During the consideration of its application by the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, the organization had provided fully satisfactory replies to questions and had been prepared to provide further information if required. No valid reasons had been presented by delegations for refusing the application.

15. *The vote was taken by roll-call.*

16. *The Czech Republic, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.*

In favour:

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Lithuania, Mexico, Panama, Poland, Republic of Korea, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Against:

Bangladesh, Benin, Chad, China, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea, Indonesia, Madagascar, Mauritania, Namibia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates.

Abstaining:

Angola, Belize, Guyana, Haiti, India, Paraguay, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Turkey.

17. *Draft decision E/2006/L.26 was adopted by 24 votes to 16, with 10 abstentions.*

18. **Mr. Guo** Jiakun (China) expressed concern that the Council had decided to grant consultative status to

those three organizations. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations was responsible for considering applications for consultative status. His delegation hoped that the decisions taken by the Council would not affect the future work or credibility of the Committee.

19. **Ms. Houngbedji** (Benin) said the Council should not have taken action on draft decisions that had been drafted several months earlier and it had not respected established procedures. The Council's action had established an unfortunate precedent.

20. **The President** said that the Council had acted in full conformity with established procedures and had made informed decisions that superseded the decisions taken in July 2006.

21. **Mr. Zheglov** (Russian Federation) said that the mandate of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations should be respected. In adopting the three draft decisions, the Council had assumed functions beyond its mandate and had undermined the work of the Committee. His delegation hoped that the Council would not undermine the Committee in future.

Draft decision VI contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2006 regular session (E/2006/32 (Part I))

22. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft decision VI contained in document E/2006/32 (Part I).

23. *Draft decision VI was adopted.*

Draft decision V contained in the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its 2006 resumed session (E/2006/32 (Part II))

24. **The President** invited the Council to take action on draft decision V contained in document E/2006/32 (Part II).

25. *Draft decision V was adopted.*

The meeting rose at 4.45 p.m.

United Nations E/2006/SR.48

Economic and Social Council

Provisional

1 February 2007

Original: English

Substantive session of 2006

Provisional summary record of the 48th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 15 December 2006, at 4 p.m.

President: Mr. Hachani ..... (Tunisia)

Contents

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*)

(c) Participation of intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*)

(a) Elections, nominations, confirmations and appointments (*continued*)

Economic and environmental questions (*continued*)

(a) Sustainable development (*continued*)

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*)

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(h) Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (*continued*)

Follow-up to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 61/6 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(h) Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (*continued*)

Closure of the resumed substantive session of 2006

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent *within one week of the date of this document* to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza.

06-66410 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters (*continued*)

1. **The President** said that he had just met with the Secretary-General-designate, Mr. Ban Ki-moon, and had given him an overview of the Council's activities, including the new functions assigned to it by the 2005 World Summit. Mr. Ban had stressed the high priority he attached to the field of development and information cooperation as well as his personal commitment to working closely with the Council.

Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies: draft annex relating to the World Tourism Organization (E/2006/70)

2. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to defer consideration of the item until its organizational session of 2007.

3. *It was so decided.*

(c) Participation of intergovernmental organizations in the work of the Economic and Social Council (*continued*) (E/2006/21, 87)

4. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) recalled that his delegation had requested further information on the functions, structure and operations of the International Emergency Management Organization.

5. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Council) said that the Secretariat was ready to oblige.

6. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to defer consideration of the organization's application for observer status.

7. *It was so decided.*

8. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to take note of the withdrawal by the secretariat of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of its application for observer status.

9. *It was so decided.*

(a) Elections, nominations, confirmations and appointments (*continued*)

Commission on Population and Development

10. **The President** said that the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States had endorsed Grenada and Honduras to fill its two outstanding vacancies on the Commission on Population and Development. He took it that the Council wished to elect by acclamation the candidates proposed, for a four-year term beginning at the Commission's forty-first session and expiring at the close of its forty-fourth session.

11. *It was so decided.*

12. **The President** said that he took it that the Council agreed to further defer the election of one member from the Group of Asian States and one member from the Group of Western European and Other States, for the same four-year term.

13. *It was so decided.*

Commission on Science and Technology for Development

14. **The President** said that the Group of Western European and Other States had endorsed Belgium and Turkey to fill its two outstanding vacancies on the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. He took it that the Council wished to elect by acclamation the candidates proposed, for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 2007.

15. *It was so decided.*

16. **The President**, recalling that the Council had decided to enlarge the Commission's membership, said that the modalities for electing ten new members had yet to be finalized. Those elections were expected to take place in early 2007.

Executive Board of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

17. **The President** said that the Group of Western European and Other States had endorsed Israel to fill its vacant seat on the Executive Board of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women. Similarly, the Group of Asian States had endorsed the Philippines and the Syrian Arab Republic to fill its two outstanding vacancies. He thus took it that the Council wished to elect those candidates by acclamation.

18. *It was so decided.*

19. **The President** said that that he took it that the Council agreed to further defer the election of two members from the Group of African States and two members from the Group of Eastern European States. They would be elected for three-year terms beginning on 1 January 2007.

20. *It was so decided.*

Committee for the United Nations Population Award

21. **The President** said that Lesotho had been endorsed by the Group of African States to fill one of its three seats. Malaysia had been endorsed by the Group of Asian States and the Czech Republic by the Group of Eastern European States, each to fill a remaining vacancy. He took it that the Council wished to elect those members by acclamation, for a three-year term beginning on 1 January 2007.

22. *It was so decided.*

23. **The President** said that he also took it that the Council agreed to further defer the election of two members from the Group of African States.

24. *It was so decided.*

Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme

25. **The President** said that Italy had been endorsed by the Group of Western European and Other States to fill that Group's remaining vacancy on the Governing Council of the United Nations Human Settlements Programme. He took it that the Council wished to elect that member by acclamation, for a four-year term beginning on 1 January 2007.

26. *It was so decided.*

27. **The President** said that he further took it that the Council wished to postpone the election of three members from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

28. *It was so decided.*

29. **The President** recalled that a vacancy remained from 2005 on the Governing Council for one member from the Group of Asian States, for a term beginning on the date of election and expiring on 31 December 2008. To date, no candidature had been received.

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (E/2006/9/Add.21)

30. **The President** invited the Council to fill a vacancy arising from the resignation of Mr. Giorgio Malinverni of Switzerland. The Government of Switzerland had nominated Ms. Barbara Wilson to replace him. He drew attention to the biographical information contained in document E/2006/9/Add.21. He took it that the Council wished to elect Ms. Wilson, by acclamation, to complete the unexpired portion of Mr. Malinverni's term of office.

31. *It was so decided.*

Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters (E/2006/9/Add.20)

32. **The President** said that Mr. Yoshiki Takeuchi of Japan and Mr. Talmon de Paula Freitas of Brazil had resigned from the Committee of Experts on International Cooperation in Tax Matters. The Secretary-General had decided to appoint Mr. Nobuyuki Nakamura and Mr. Eduardo Zaidensztat Capnnikcas to replace Mr. Takeuchi and Mr. Freitas respectively. The relevant biographical information was contained in document E/2006/9/Add.20. He took it that the Council wished to take note of those appointments.

33. *It was so decided.*

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population Fund

34. **The President** said that Sweden was resigning its seat on the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population Fund, effective 1 January 2007. He took it that the Council wished to elect Denmark to replace Sweden, for a term beginning on 1 January 2007 and expiring on 31 December 2009.

35. *It was so decided.*

Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission

36. **The President** said that the Czech Republic had been endorsed by the Group of Eastern European States and Indonesia had been endorsed by the Group of Asian States to fill two of the three upcoming vacancies on the Organizational Committee of the Peacebuilding Commission. He took it that the Council

wished to elect by acclamation the Czech Republic and to re-elect Indonesia for terms beginning on 1 January 2007 and expiring on 22 June 2008 and to defer the election of one member from the Group of Western European and Other States.

37. *It was so decided.*

Economic and environmental questions (*continued*)

(a) Sustainable development (*continued*)

Report of the Committee for Development Policy on its eighth session (E/2006/33, chap. I, sect. A, recommendations I and II) *and draft decision E/2006/L.38*

38. **Mr. Mérorès** (Haiti) drew attention to draft decision E/2006/L.38 calling for action on recommendation I contained in the report of the Committee for Development Policy (E/2006/33), that Papua New Guinea should be included in the list of least developed countries, should be deferred to the high-level segment of the 2007 substantive session of the Council.

39. *Draft decision E/2006/L.38 was adopted.*

40. **The President** said that he took it that the Council also wished to defer consideration of recommendation II (that Samoa should be graduated from the list) to its organizational session of 2007.

41. *It was so decided.*

(b) Science and technology for development (*continued*)

Report of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development on its ninth session (E/2006/31, chap. I, sect. A, draft resolution)

42. **Mr. Čekuolis** (Lithuania) said that following informal consultations, it had been agreed that the Council should defer to its organizational session of 2007 consideration of the draft resolution contained in the report.

Draft decision E/2006/L.39: Enlargement of the Commission on Science and Technology

43. **The President** said that the draft decision had no programme budget implications.

44. *Draft decision E/2006/L.39 was adopted.*

45. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to defer consideration of remaining matters relating to the report of the Commission on Science and Technology for Development until its organizational session of 2007.

46. *It was so decided.*

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(h) Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (*continued*)

Recommendations contained in the report of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues on its fifth session (E/2006/43, chap. I, sect. A, draft decisions; E/2006/L.18)

47. **Ms. de Laurentis** (Secretary of the Council) said that at its 41st meeting, during its substantive session, the Secretary of the Council had made a statement on the programme budget implications of draft decisions I and III, contained in the report of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues on its fifth session (E/2006/43) concluding that additional requirements relating to decision I could be reduced from $87,300 to $58,000 and total requirements relating to draft decisions I and III could be reduced from $577,700 to $548,400. As the Council had decided, in its decision 2006/243, to defer consideration of the report, the Secretariat had further reviewed the potential for absorption of the additional requirements in relation to draft decision I. The $58,000 could in fact be met through potential savings in the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, under the current total appropriation for the travel of members of all policymaking organs under section 9, "Economic and social affairs", owing, inter alia, to non-participation, partial participation and delays. It was thus estimated that draft decision I would not entail any further financial implications. Should draft decisions I and III be adopted, the total additional resources required would amount to $490,400, including $360,800 under section 2, "General Assembly affairs and conference services", $96,000 under the above-mentioned section 9 and $33,600 under section 18, "Economic and social development in Asia and the Pacific".

48. **The President** invited the Council to consider draft decision I, entitled "International expert group meeting on the Convention on Biological Diversity international regime on access and benefit-sharing and indigenous peoples' human rights".

49. *Draft decision I was adopted.*

50. **Mr. Smith** (United Kingdom) said that the issue in question was of great importance for indigenous people. However, his delegation's support for the decision did not constitute acceptance of the principle that some groups in society should benefit from human rights that were not available to others. With the exception of the right to self-determination, the United Kingdom did not accept the concept of collective human rights in international law.

51. **The President** suggested that the Council should postpone consideration of draft decision II until the theme for the 2007 coordination segment had been decided.

52. *It was so decided.*

53. **The President** invited the Council to turn to draft decision III, entitled "Venue and dates for the sixth session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues". If the session were held in New York, programme budget implications would be avoided. He thus took it that the Council wished to amend the draft decision by changing the venue from Bangkok to New York.

54. *Draft decision III was adopted as orally amended.*

55. **The President** invited the Council to consider draft decision IV, entitled "Provisional agenda and documentation for the sixth session of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues".

56. *Draft decision IV was adopted.*

Follow-up to the implementation of General Assembly resolution 61/6 on the strengthening of the Economic and Social Council

57. **Mr. Ruiz Massieu Aguirre** (Mexico) said that although members had agreed on a theme for the coordination segment, they had yet to arrive at a consensus in respect of the themes for the thematic discussion and Annual Ministerial Review. Deferral of the item would allow members to take full account of the new functions of the Council as well as the outcome of high-level substantive discussions.

58. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to defer consideration of the focus of the 2007 thematic discussion and theme for the Annual Ministerial Review to its 2007 organizational session.

59. *It was so decided.*

60. **The President** said that he took it that the Council was, however, ready to adopt the theme "The role of the United Nations system in promoting full and productive employment and decent work for all" for the 2007 coordination segment.

61. *It was so decided.*

Draft decision E/2006/L.40: Contributions of relevant subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council, including functional and regional commissions, and the organizations of the United Nations system to the annual ministerial-level substantive review and the Development Cooperation Forum

62. **Mr. Čekuolis** (Lithuania) said that the text had been drafted on the basis of informal consultations.

63. *Draft decision E/2006/L.40 was adopted.*

Social and human rights questions (*continued*)

(h) Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (*continued*)

Recommendations contained in the report of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues on its fifth session (*continued*) (E/2006/43, chap. I, sect. A, draft decision II)

Draft decision II

64. **The President** said that he took it that, in light of the adoption of the theme for the 2007 coordination segment, the Council did not wish to take action on draft decision II.

65. *It was so decided.*

66. **The President** said that he took it that the Council wished to take note of the report.

67. *It was so decided.*

Closure of the resumed substantive session of 2006

68. After an exchange of courtesies in which **Mr. Cabral** (Guinea-Bissau), **Mr. Rosengren** (Observer for Finland), on behalf of the European Union, **Mr. Sow** (Guinea) and **Mr. Le Roux** (South Africa), on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, participated, **the President** declared the session closed.

The meeting rose at 5.15 p.m.